

Subject: Re: Question

Date: 08 Oct 1999 02:03:07 GMT

From: staywild@aol.com (Stay Wild)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

greenanarchist wrote:

TAK >Umm, I really do not understand what exactly is going on with all the fascist
>rhetoric on the alt.fan.unabomber list. Could one of the fascists please try
>to
>explain (politely, if possible) exactly what it is they hope to accomplish?

Sorry, I am not one of the fascists and so I really don't have a clue as to what they hope to accomplish.

>My apologies to the long-time list users who may already have a handle on
>this,
>I am just really astounded by what I have found on here since I came in last
>week.

I am a long time lurker, unmasking I think for the first time. I have found the fascist drivel here quite astounding as well. I must say, however, I have been impressed with your postings. You have brought new life to the group. Just do what I do, delete their posts. I do read some of their posts every now and then just to reconfirm that they are indeed insane. Like most usenet groups this one has a high noise to voice ratio...

Again, thanks for your recent postings. Don't let the trolls scare you away.

As Always,
Stay Wild

10 / 8 / 99

Dear Ted,

Here are some more messages posted by TAK on the alt.fan.unabomber discussion group. On page 6 of the first series that I sent (9/3b) there is an odd verb usage that worried me: "I believe's". This would suggest "he believes" and thus the true "Spirit" in which TAK is operating.

Beau.

Subject: ELF news

Date: 07 Oct 1999 21:58:49 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Shadow, Thanks for posting the great news below:

Communiqué

Greetings from the Earth Liberation Front.

we are claiming responsibility for the second attack upon C S
McRossan's machinery.

<snip>

This is just the beginning of a new level of battling against highway 55 and
car culture. We urge the elves of MN and the world to unite against the profit
hauling infrastructures around the globe. Target machines, offices, and
equipment used to build roads. We are everywhere and we are watching. We will
be back.

live simply

AK How nice! I do so love those little earth liberation fairies!

Live Wild or Die,

Green Anarchist

Subject: Boston Globe TK article

Date: 07 Oct 1999 14:19:42 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Where it says <text redacted> I have removed my name. I feel it is irrelevant in the context of this forum. But I wanted to post this in response to some of the accusations on this list that my postings are some kind of hoax. You can find it on the Globe website anyway.

Green Anarchist

DATE: THURSDAY, September 30, 1999 TAG: 9910010191
SECTION: National/Foreign EDITION: Third
PAGE: A9 LENGTH: 61 lines
SOURCE: By Brian MacQuarrie, Globe Staff

KACZYNSKI SAYS ROAD TRIGGERED 'REVENGE'

A road, newly cut through a Montana paradise, may have turned Theodore Kaczynski onto a one-way path of revolution.

In what is believed to be the Unabomber's first published interview since he was arrested in 1996, Kaczynski, the man who used package bombs to kill and maim for nearly two decades, said his discovery of a road in a wilderness sanctuary set him on a mission to topple modern society.

"From that point on," Kaczynski said, "I decided that . . . I would work on getting back at the system. Revenge."

Kaczynski, now imprisoned on a life sentence in Colorado, made the comments in an interview published this week in the London-based journal Green Anarchist.

From 1978 to 1995, three people were killed and 23 injured by elaborate bombs credited to the Unabomber, who targeted workers at universities, airlines, biotechnology companies, and advertising agencies.

Kaczynski was interviewed by <text redacted>, a former writer for the Earth First! journal in Eugene, Ore. <text redacted>, who had been corresponding with Kaczynski, spoke with him over four days in June and July.

Although the Unabomber's explosions have been traced to a 1978 blast at Northwestern University, <text redacted> said Kaczynski had said he did not fully commit himself to violent revolution until 1983.

In that summer, Kaczynski said, he struck out for one of his favorite places: a rugged, lonely plateau about two days from his cabin in Lincoln, Mont.

"There were too many people around my cabin, so I decided I needed some peace. I went back to the plateau, and when I got there I found they had put a road right through the middle of it," Kaczynski said. "You just can't imagine how upset I was."

Kaczynski said he had been driven to action he would have preferred to avoid. "The honest truth is that I am not really politically oriented. I would have really rather just be living out in the woods," he told <text redacted>.

"If nobody had started cutting roads through there and cutting the trees down and come buzzing around in helicopters and snowmobiles, I would still just be living there, and the rest of the world could just take care of itself."

In the interview, Kaczynski did not confess to any crimes of violence, but said that a successful revolution against modern society, which he advocates, would result in massive loss of life.

"For those who realize the need to do away with the techno-industrial system, if you work for its collapse, in effect you are killing a lot of people," Kaczynski said from federal prison in Florence, Colo.

``He didn't ask for any special treatment or to be treated in any certain way,' ' <text redacted> said of Kaczynski. ``There was no limit on what I could ask him, but he reserved the right to decline to answer questions on specifics in the Unabomber case.' '

<text redacted> resigned from Earth First!, which opposes violence, when the journal's editors declined to publish the interview because of its content. John Connor, the editor of Green Anarchist, said he had heard tapes of the interview. ``The range of details, political beliefs, and personal information on the tape could only have come from Kaczynski,' ' Connor said.

Kaczynski told <text redacted> his disillusionment with society began in 1962, his senior year at Harvard University.

note two errors in this report:

Where it says:

"Kaczynski was interviewed by <text redacted>, a former writer for the Earth First! journal in Eugene, Ore."

I was not a "writer" for the EF! J, I was a member of the editorial collective, i.e., an editor - the EF! J has no "writers"

Where it says:

"<text redacted> resigned from Earth First!, which opposes violence, when the journal's editors declined to publish the interview because of its content."

That is not true and I did not say that. There were several reasons why I left after working at the paper for a year and I left the J on good terms.

Subject: Response for "Max"

Date: 08 Oct 1999 13:39:24 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Response to:

Subject: Re: Question From: renodecaro@aol.com (RenoDeCaro)

Date: Thu, 07 October 1999 09:19 PM EDT

Message-id: <19991007211954.27315.00000235@ng-cq1.aol.com>

Greenanarchist wrote:

>Umm, I really do not understand what exactly is going on with all the fascist rhetoric on the alt.fan.unabomber list. Could one of the fascists please try to explain (politely, if possible) exactly what it is they hope to accomplish?>

Max wrote:

>I wrote a short critique of some of your views as stated on this group. Since I am extremely curious to see how someone holding those views deals with the objections I raised, I have been sitting on pins and needles waiting for your reply. Now I am disappointed to see that you would rather change the subject. Let's reach a compromise, shall we? You address my critique of some of your beliefs and I will explain politely what those whom you label "fascists" hope to accomplish. Fair enough?>

OK Max, I'll bite, but then I am not going to play with the fascists anymore. Actually, I am on the road again after today and will not be signing back on for a while.

Greenanarchist wrote:

>And mine, when backed into a philosophical corner, I admit that what motivates me as an activist is more "spiritual" than "rational" as we understand those terms.>

Max wrote:

<I can appreciate your honesty in stating this.>

Thanks, I guess.

< Neither FBI Susie nor Peter (not Jewish) would admit to (perhaps I should say "recognize") being backed into a philosophical corner, nor could they ever point at a spiritual basis for their beliefs.>

Since I don't know that much about the performance of "FBI Susie nor Peter (not Jewish)" on this list I cannot fully appreciate your slagging them for the purposes of patronizing me.

<In FBI Susie's case, she would like to send a rabid FBI after those who backed her into a philosophical corner. Not very spiritual, don't you agree?>

Again, don't know what you're talking about.

<For Susie's benefit you should ask T.K. how he feels about individuals who want to turn into the FBI those with whom they disagree. The

answer should slow down a bit all the patronizing FBI Susie feels compelled to do for you.>

see above

Greenanarchist wrote:

>I have always felt a deep affinity with nature. When I consider my actions, I think of whether or not they would be approved of by the Wolf nation, the Lynx nation, the Hawk nation, the community of all living, growing, wondrous things I share this planet with, as much as, if not more than, by my fellow humans.>

Max wrote:

>There is no doubt that what you say sounds good. The problem is that in this century, already too much that used to work has been replaced by what sounds good but does NOT work. >

I am not exactly sure what you mean here.

>If you take your view to its conclusion, you will want the approval of all the animal and plants required for food and other necessities to sustain you. With the highest of probabilities, this approval will not be forthcoming and you will die...>

I disagree. I think that the community of "animal and plants required for food and other necessities to sustain" me inherently recognizes the interdependence of all living things and reality of the food chain.

That is, if I kill in order to meet my immediate needs - for survival, i.e. food, clothing and shelter - I am living just like every other animal on the planet. There is no need for me to feel guilty about that. Everything dies in its time, that is a fact.

I think TK understands this as well. While he did not ask for the approval of the rabbits he killed, he respected their will to live and appreciated the contribution they made to his survival - thanking them for giving up their lives to sustain his. That is what is important, respecting life.

Max wrote:

<leaving the planet to those who did not harbor such noble, but unworkable, ideas.>

They are workable ideas - they worked for thousands, no millions, of years.

But you are correct in the sense that it is not enough for individuals involved in the rebellion to just give up and go live "off the grid" and let the rest of the world go on the way it is going. We must actively resist those who do not harbor such noble goals and see the revolution through. It is a matter of self-defense.

The resistance, those who despise the techno-industrial system and who advocate living in harmony with wild nature, have been called to the battlefield. We did not seek this conflict but we must respond, bravely and decisively. We must use all the tools in the toolbox to destroy the enemy that seeks to destroy us.

Greenanarchist:

>I know that people can speak for themselves, as a biocentric eco-anarchist, I am here to speak for that which has no representation in government, no corporate sponsor, no voice in the world of men... we can be forces of nature too.>

Max wrote:

<That makes you a fellow who deals with similar problems of the revisionists and race realists. They too are speaking "for that which has no representation in government, no corporate sponsor, no voice in the world....." >

You are missing my point. People - all humans - can speak for themselves. Even if certain people have not gained power yet, they have the potential to within human society. Non-human species do not.

And, by the way, what makes you assume that I am "a fellow" ;-)

<Contrary to them, though, you are not opposed by a government and media industry that work around the clock to villainize you and who indoctrinate the population through every means at its disposal that what you say is the greatest evil imaginable.>

Who is the "them" you are referring to in this statement - the people you call "race realists"? I have never heard this term. And who is being "villainized" the fascists? I wonder why?

<Consequently, you don't have to deal with the products of this hateful indoctrination campaign. In other words, you don't have to deal with the "anti-haters" on this group who love to hate those whom they accuse of being haters.>

You are losing me here Max... I thought this list was for people who certainly do admit to hating the techno-industrial system as I do. But I do not attribute the propagation of the system to any particular group of humans (like Jewish people, for example).... except that I will say I've been known to be able to make a pretty good case against a particular gender as having had more of a hand in the destruction of the wild and in promoting an ethic of exploitation.

After all, hierarchical societies have always had male leaders, no army of women has ever been led against an army of women, there have been no female fascist dictators... and who invented electricity, nuclear power, guns, steel, chainsaws, automobiles, computers, bulldozers, etc?

I would say that if we are looking for specific culprits, that is where I would start looking - at males in general - not males from a particular geographical region or ethnicity - all of them everywhere seem pretty determined to mess things up. Don't you agree?

But what would be the benefit in that? I would rather focus on what needs to be done to change things for the better without advocating the extermination of the male gender based on their well-documented propensity to always fuck things up.

Greenanarchist wrote:

>I believe there have always been critics of civilization, perhaps destined to always be in the minority by the state of things today. But for the past 10,000 years I bet there were folks who argued that their societies should not create permanent habitations, build roads & pyramids, create armies, manipulate nature, etc...>

Max said:

<No doubt true, but as Oswald Spengler (a crackpot, according to Hertzlinger) pointed out, those who embraced ideas contrary to technological progress always wound up the victims of those who championed them.>

Yes, that is usually true, but it is not a reason for me to give up. And there are instances, though, where cultures have abandoned technologies that they realized were not in their best interests. For example, the Chinese political philosophers always believed that civilization was a dangerous thing and envisioned a "golden age" in their nomadic pastoralist/hunter-gatherer past that they were getting farther and farther away from as a result of civilizing impulses. This caused them to go more slowly and value that past.

Max wrote:

>Life is a struggle for all life forms and every one of them lives at the expense of another life form.>

Yes, I acknowledged this above

>We humans did not set up the system this way and, most importantly, we can't change it.<

"We" is an important word here. Not all humans set the system up this way, just the evil takers. And the "we" that I hope can change it are the real revolutionaries I seek to support.

>All we can hope for is that, in our quest to make our lives more comfortable, we don't ultimately destroy parts of nature we need for our long-term survival.<

Ick - I disagree with this anthropocentric statement completely. My quest in life is not to make my life more "comfortable" in the way that I think that you mean it (more modern conveniences). Comfort is a relative term, I could say I believe my life would be more comfortable if there were not washing machines and automobiles and indoor plumbing and electricity - because then I would be living in a world where there were equal rights for all species and humans were free from the bonds of the techno-industrial system. That would make me more comfortable.

And I do not share your utilitarian views about why we should respect nature - it is not for the sake of long-term human survival - it is because it is the right thing, the compassionate, the intelligent - thing to do.

>In my opinion, the answers to save the planet for mankind have to come from technology.<

Again, my question is not how to "save the planet for mankind"... so my answer will necessarily be different I suppose. I want to see the natural balance between humans and the ecosystems we inhabit restored. Doing away with the techno-industrial system and undermining the worldview that engenders it is the most important first step.

>As improbable as it seems--that the cause of the problem could also produce its salvation--it is still considerably more feasible than to expect we would be able to do away with technology.<

You got the part about it being improbable right, that's all.

Shadow wrote:

>>Religion has seemed to be one of the most powerful forces shaping culture.

At least in the last 2000 years. It has not always been a force for good, either.

Nevertheless, I feel it is one

of the few forces which has a chance to stand up to the force of material greed which has ruled the planet for the past few centuries.>>

Max wrote:

>To say religion "has not always been a force for good" is a monumental understatement if you're talking of the Jewish religions like Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. A more accurate description is that nothing man has invented has caused as much suffering during the last 2,000 years as have the religions mentioned above. To expect salvation to come from those forces who have a 2,000-year history of causing problems for human beings is either an act of desperation or ignorance.<

I would beg to differ, in the sense that the stories we tell ourselves about the nature of existence - call it our religion, our worldview, whatever - have an awfully lot to do with how we live our mundane lives, the decisions we make, the ethics we adhere to, the value system we promote. In that sense, yes, the "religions" that have put man above nature have been incredibly destructive. But others, for example the Taoist worldview, might have as much power to transform society for the better.

Greenanarchist wrote:

That is to say, when city people try to recreate the spirituality that comes naturally to those who interact with wilderness on a daily basis, it seems false and forced. I do not believe one can live in an artificial, human-centered urban environment and be confronted with the sensations that induces on a daily basis and still be truly connected spiritually with the wild. You must walk the walk to authentically talk the talk. I personally feel that only when people get back into the wilderness and actually live in harmony with wild nature again will they find the emotional strength and courage to accomplish what needs to be accomplished for the revolution to succeed, since that is the actual source of the strength.

Max wrote:

>Once again I'm with you right up to your last sentence. If enough people ventured out into the wilderness, they would only be able to exist as long as the piece of real estate they appropriated was not desired by the technocrats who stayed behind in the city developing weapons. Shamanistic spiritual thinking has proven highly ineffective against machine guns.<

I think we need to always remember to go forth with good intentions - cultivating our spiritual connection to the wild where I still believe our strength comes from. The technocrats must be destroyed, by whatever means necessary. We can hope that a change in consciousness might do it and we should try hard to rationally convince the captives of the techno-industrial system to change their ways, but we also have the right to self-defense. I understand the pathology of pacifism - I am not a pacifist. I know we are at war.

But I am at war with the system and the mass culture that supports it - and the actual machines that are causing the destruction. These are the proper targets, I see no benefit in fascist rhetoric that tries to pin all of the world's ills on a particular race - other than, in general terms, the human race. I suggest the fascists hone their rhetoric in a broader, more generally misanthropic direction.

For the Wild,

Green Anarchist

Subject: Re: Hwy 55 & Earth Liberation Front communiqué

Date: 08 Oct 1999 13:43:55 GMT

From: greenanarchist@aol.com (Greenanarchist)

Organization: AOL <http://www.aol.com>

Newsgroups: alt.fan.unabomber

Nice post.. I agree completely!

From: "David Hainsworth" david@hainsworth.freemove.co.uk

>Date: Fri, 08 October 1999 06:46 AM EDT

>Message-id: <7tkiu9\$13v\$1@news7.svr.pol.co.uk>

>ELF should keep up with what they do, It is my belief that the consensus
>within the movement is that we have had enough of the way capitalism / THE
>MAN has ruined the way we live.

>
>The ELF accept responsibility for their actions, but are not stupid enough
>to help THE MAN by giving themselves up, what would be the
>point of that. Earth Firsters want grassroots democracy but as we do not
>live in a democratic world why should we help them destroy us and put
>ourselves in prison. The so called vandalism / sabotage can be a great means
>of stopping the man making Profit or gaining more Power and that is all
>the

>man is bothered about.

>
>Business insurance costs money. If the insurance company has to pay out
>they

>will increase their charges which means Vail etc will have less profit.

>-

>Good!! they may get out of the business.

>
>Local or national law enforcement goons do not need an excuse to use
>violence, and to look the other way. They have always been supporters of
>the

>state and or business, not of the people.

>
>(You say -There is an appropriate, effective kind of nonviolent civil
>disobedience. Sneaking around and burning buildings and damaging
>construction equipment under cover of darkness ain't it.)

>

>It can be for some!!!

>anyhow you cannot be violent to property only to sentient beings.

>

>Do not think your way is the only way, fight them anyway you can but stay
>free!!